

The Chairman: I suppose that other members of the committee want to ask questions on what you have said. We will have an opportunity of course this afternoon to go on with this kind of dialogue.

Before I ask the other members of the committee to ask questions I should like to add to what Senator Grosart has already said about the impact this committee has had. We have had in Canada a Cabinet committee on scientific and industrial research since 1916, but that Cabinet committee, which was supposed to deal with all of these matters, very seldom met and in the last 10 years apparently never met at all. As a result I suppose of our inquiry too, and I am sure also due to the initiative of very first class public servants as well—we have one here with us this morning, Dr. Uffen—this Cabinet that never used to meet is now meeting regularly. I am sure that this is a big improvement at least in the central machinery for dealing with science policy matters. This is another impact that can be attributed to the work of our committee.

Senator Grosart: Mr. Chairman, may I make this comment? I would not want it to appear that my remarks were intended to be critical of what you have called the “solitudes” in our science establishment. On the contrary, I think it is greatly to their credit that they seized this opportunity to the extent they did and went to the trouble to present the very, very excellent briefs that we have had.

In commenting on the result of the ad hoc development of what passes for science policy, I was not suggesting that the fault lay entirely with them. In fact, in my opinion it lies entirely with the legislature, because parliamentarians in Canada have not, until recently, involved themselves in the problem of science policy.

Senator Carter: Mr. Chairman, I should like to preface my question by saying what a pleasure it is to have Chairman Daddario and his colleagues from the United States Congress here with us this morning. I would like to compliment them on the excellent presentations they have made to us. After listening to them my first reaction is that we shall probably have to add another chapter to our report.

The Chairman: I hope not.

Senator Grosart: What is the title?

Senator Carter: Mr. Daddario put his finger on one of the basic problems that has confronted our committee as well as his and that is the desirability of technical assessment for the future and trying to get forecasts of technical advancements and their possible effects on society and what can be done about undesirable effects. He has pointed out how difficult it is to accomplish that in a society where we have no control and where we believe in a philosophy of free enterprise and free consumer choice. If I understood him correctly he stated that somehow we have got to find way of getting industry to take measures voluntarily on their own part before reaching the point where they have to be forced to do something.

That reminded me of a current discussion that is going on now about the use of detergents which I heard last night over television and again this morning. Apparently, a committee has made some investigation on detergents and they have discovered that phosphate contents of detergents on this side of the ocean range all the way from 48 per cent down to 23 per cent, but over in Sweden they have a fairly satisfactory detergent which has only 10 per cent. Our Government has given up any hope of achieving any voluntary action on the part of industry and is about to bring in a law which will force industry to eliminate phosphate or at least to bring it down to a satisfactory level in their product.

I was wondering if Mr. Daddario would elaborate a little further on this. How does he see it? What mechanism does he see we should employ to try to bring industry to act voluntarily before the situation gets so bad that Government has to enforce action.

Congressman Daddario: Of course, Senator Carter. You ask one of the very difficult questions with which we are faced in government, that is, the relationship of government to the private sector. What I did want to point out is that in our hearings on technology assessment which have been on the way now for four to five years, we have developed a concern in the country on this subject. This concern reflected favourably on the way in which these basic ideas had permeated the thinking of some of our industrial groups. Leaders of these groups have made statements about the need to do something about the second order consequences of their technological activities.

I pointed out that only as communication increases could we expect to take advantage of these ideas. One of our great companies